

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

YIRENYS GONZALEZ-VIAMONTES, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY,  
 Defendant.

Case No.: 2:24-cv-01421-GMN-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 16]

Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulation to extend discovery deadlines. Docket No. 16.

A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good cause analysis turns on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992).

Here, the parties have failed to demonstrate diligence. The Court issued the scheduling order in this case on October 1, 2024. Docket No. 14. Nonetheless, the parties waited until November to conduct any discovery at all, and have conducted almost no discovery. Docket No. 16 at 3. Further, the stipulation seeks relief due to numerous scheduling conflicts and because "the parties would like to reach a settlement." *Id.* However, the stipulation fails to explain why those circumstances justify a three-month extension of deadlines. Such an extension appears excessive on its face in relation to the circumstance identified.

Additionally, the instant stipulation fails to meet the requirements of the local rules. The parties do not provide a specific description of the discovery that remains to be completed, *see* Local Rule 26-3(b); instead, the parties submit that the discovery to be completed includes "subpoena, written discovery, and additional depositions." Docket No. 16 at 3.

